1		JUDGE MARTINEZ	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7 8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE		
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) NO CDOC 140DGM	
10	Plaintiff,	NO. CR06-149RSM	
11	v.	) )	
12	JOSE L. GALINDO-ZURITA, et. al.,	ORDER CONTINUING PRETRIAL MOTIONS DEADLINE	
13	Defendants.	) AND TRIAL DATE	
14		<i>)</i>	
15	On behalf of all parties, the United States filed an Unopposed Motion for Order		
16	continuing the pretrial motions due date and the trial date, currently set for July 13 and		
17	August 28, 2006, respectively.		
18	This Court's decision is based on the facts stated in the Unopposed Motion and		
19	apparent from the record, including the following specific findings:		
20	1. This case is complex and involves two related indictments and nineteen		
21	charged conspirators. It stems from a long-term investigation involving multiple agencies,		
22	and included the simultaneous execution of over thirty search warrants in two states on the		
23	date of arrest. The charges carry the potential for mandatory 10-year,		
24	20-year, or even mandatory life sentences for some defendants, depending on criminal		

2. This case involves a large volume of discovery that counsel must review prior to trial. Among this discovery is several thousand conversations intercepted over three Courtauthorized Title III wire intercepts (wiretaps). Many of these calls are not in English, and

history.

25

26

27

28

7

8

11

12

10

13 14

15 16

17

18

20

19

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

must be translated into English for counsel and the Court. The translation effort has been complicated by the fact that some calls are in an indigenous language of Southern Mexico, Mixteco Bajo, for which English-speaking translators are very difficult to find. The transcription/translation process in this case is expected to take several months. A continuance of the motions and trial dates will ensure that counsel has sufficient time to review these telephone calls prior to trial.

- 3. Defendants' counsel need additional time to prepare for motions, plea negotiations, and trial, in order to provide defendants with adequate, effective, and continued representation. Counsel assert that proceeding with the current motions and trial dates would result in a miscarriage of justice. Counsel agree that an approximate three-month continuance is appropriate and necessary in light of the factors listed above.
- Defendants' counsel anticipate that each of their clients will issue a written knowing, voluntary, and intelligent waiver of his/her right to a speedy trial through November, 2006.
- 5. In light of the interest of the public in ensuring the accused adequate, effective, and continued representation by counsel presently assigned, this Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting a continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and defendants in a speedy trial. This Court further concludes that the above findings and bases for continuing the trial comport with 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h) and the United States Supreme Court's recent decision in Zedner v. United States, 126 S. Ct. 1976 (2006).

Accordingly, for the reasons listed above and those apparent from the record, the Unopposed Motion for Continuance is HEREBY GRANTED.

Trial is reset for November 13, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.

Pretrial Motions are due on September 7, 2006.

The Court further finds that time from the filing of the stipulated motion through the new trial date shall be excluded from computation under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A), 3161(h)(8)(B)(i), and 3161(h)(8)(B)(ii) because the failure to grant the requested continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice, and because the case is so complex due

1	to the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, and the existence of novel	
2	questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial	
3	proceedings or for the trial itself within the tim	ne limits established by the Speedy Trial Act.
4	Dated this18 day of July, 2006.	
5		Www.
6		RICARDO S. MARTINEZ UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
7	Presented by:	OMILD STATES DISTRICT VODGE
8	s/ Sarah Y. Vogel SARAH Y. VOGEL	
9	Assistant United States Attorney	
10	United States Attorney's Office	
11	700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220 Seattle, Washington 98101-1271	
12	Telephone: (206) 553-7970	
13	Facsimile: (206) 553-4440 E-mail: <u>Sarah.Vogel@usdoj.gov</u>	
14	Approved on July 10-11, 2006 by:	
15		,
16	PETER MAZZONE for Jose L. Galindo-Zurita	MICHAEL C. MARTIN for Karen M. Creech
17	s/	s/
18	HOWARD PHILLIPS for Marcela Rodriguez-Zurita	S/ BRUCE DAVID ERICKSON for Rhonda L. Schweitzer
19	s/ WALTER GEORGE PALMER	<u>s/</u> ALLEN R. BENTLEY
20	WALTER GEORGE PALMER for Jade Medina-Parra	ALLEN R. BENTLEY for Jeffrey D. French
21	s/	<u>s/</u>
22	JEFFREY C. GRANT for Juana Garcia-Rodriguez	MARK DAVID MESTEL for Mary F. Handy
23		s/
24		PETER K. MAIR for Dale L. Trisco
25		
26		
27		
28		